DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 137 SO 027 615

AUTHOR Stetson, Elton G.
TITLE Current Trends in State Curriculum Reform: A Comparison of Two Opposing National Models.
PUB DATE 1996-09-00
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Core Curriculum; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Social Studies; State Curriculum Guides; *State Standards
IDENTIFIERS California; Kentucky; South Carolina; Vermont

ABSTRACT

This reports presents a detailed description of curriculum reform efforts in four states that exemplify particular approaches to developing curriculum. In California and South Carolina, curriculum standards are influenced most heavily by subject-matter professionals through a top-down process; the lay public is asked to review and make recommended changes only after the standards are drafted. In Vermont and Kentucky, development of core curriculum begins with the lay public in statewide forums, with drafting committees then formed at the state level to translate those recommendations into curriculum standards. These two approaches to curriculum development are highlighted in the report. The paper identifies the two approaches as an intellectual elite approach (California and South Carolina) and a populist approach (Kentucky and Vermont). Five mechanisms that state level governing bodies could use to promote and support what schools do to improve academic learning include: 1) provide incentives to encourage the planning and implementation of reform; 2) contribute knowledge to the school reform process; 3) help focus schools' attention on desired learning outcomes and provide feedback; 4) provide assistance to schools wanting to redesign programs to improve student learning; and 5) replace traditional regulations imposed at the state level by assessment systems that hold schools accountable for student achievement (Lusi, 1994). (Contains 33 references.) (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 415 137

Current Trends in State Curriculum Reform:

A Comparison of Two Opposing National Models

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Written By:

Elton G. Stetson, Ed.D.
Texas A&M University - Metroplex Center
Mesquite, TX 75150

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Elton Stetson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

September, 1996

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SO 027 615

Current Trends in State Curriculum Reform:

A Comparison of Two Opposing National Models

Elton G. Stetson, Ed.D.

Defining curriculum is so controversial it would require a book-length treatment to deal with it adequately. So let us just say that Curriculum means whatever is advocated for teaching and learning (Schubert, 1993).

introduction

A description of what curriculum is, what processes are used in developing curriculum, and who is involved in these processes is the topic of this report. Specific topics addressed in this paper include:

- Core curriculum Defined
- Philosophies of Curriculum Development
- Processes of Curriculum Development at the National Level
- Processes of Curriculum Development at the State Level
- Questions for inclusion in a survey instrument administered to social studies educators to assess their awareness of core curriculum development efforts

It is difficult to discuss curriculum processes without first discussing (1) what curriculum is and (2) what some of the prevailing philosophies of curriculum development are. The essence of this report is a detailed description of the curriculum reform efforts in four states which are cited most often as states that exemplify particular approaches to developing curriculum. In two states, California and South Carolina, curriculum standards are influenced most prominently by subject matter professional experts. The process is considered top-down, and the lay public is asked to review and make recommended changes only after the standards are drafted. In Vermont and Kentucky, on the other hand, development of core curriculum begins with the lay public with forums conducted statewide. Only then are drafting

committees formed at the state level to translate those grass roots core recommendations into curriculum standards. These two approaches, one an intellectual elite approach, the other a populist approach, are highlighted in this report.

I. Core Curriculum Defined

Since curriculum has many definitions, I will rely on Schubert's (1993) generic definition of curriculum as my working definition in this document: "Curriculum means whatever is advocated for teaching and learning." (p. 3). Relative to "core" curriculum, I found as many definitions as I did people I spoke with. The National Council for the Social Studies - NCSS (1994), the best known and influential professional organization for the K-12 social studies in the country, identifies core curriculum in the form of 10 curriculum standards. These standards were developed in 1994 by the Task Force on Standards For Social Studies, a small committee of 11 professional educators who wrote the 10 curriculum standards, performance standards for each of the 10 curriculum standards, and examples of how performance standards could be implemented and assessed at three levels; elementary, middle, and high school. This approach is a professional elitist or "intellectualists" approach (Schubert, 1993) in that standards are created by experts in their fields.

On the other side of the spectrum, core curriculum, according to the National Association For Core Curriculum Inc. (NACC) (1995) is based on quite the opposite philosophy. Gordon Vars, Executive Secretary of NACC, told me in a phone interview, that NACC is diametrically opposed to core curriculum as espoused by the National Council for the Social Studies. They oppose national curriculum standards and view core from an "populist" or "experientialist" philosophy, i.e., core curriculum is what is wanted and needed by the students and by the lay public in communities in which those students dwell. Vars mentioned Vermont and Maine as benchmark states for social studies core curriculum development

from this grass roots perspective. In those states, there is little regard for national standards except as they are recommended by the general population of their states.

As a follow-up to my conversation with Vars, I spoke with Elise Guyette, a leading engineer of the Vermont social studies core curriculum reform effort. She confirmed what Gordon Vars had told me earlier. In Vermont core is considered knowledge and skills that the lay people of the state believe their students should know or be able to do. The "core" curriculum are lists of recommendations form the people and these recommendations are translated into standards. Very little regard is paid to NCSS's national standards and, since there are no adopted textbooks in Vermont, there is little evidence that developers of the core curriculum consider either existing textbooks or national standards in drafting core curriculum. The process of developing curriculum is provided in more detail later in this report.

II. Philosophies Guiding Curriculum Development

Mention has been made of the "experientialist" and "intellectualist" philosophies. Let me expand on those terms The professional literature actually identifies four prevailing philosophical influences on the development of curriculum: intellectualists, social behaviorists, experientialists, and conciliators (Schubert, 1993). Understanding these beliefs is helpful to the broader discussion of **WHAT** the curriculum is, **WHO** decides the curriculum, and **HOW** decisions are made. Let me summarize the four philosophies.

- **Intellectual Traditionalists:** Adhere to ideals of Western intellectual history. The "great books" are important. Emphasis is on great ideas derived from the classics. All students should have access to the best ideas the human race has achieved.

  Social Behaviorists: Adhere to a positivist notion of science, i.e., a belief in empirical evidence. Use what successful people do as models for determining how to induct young

people into society. Pay attention to "time on task" research and link teaching to test scores. Believe in systematic needs assessment, detailed planning of objectives and activities to further objectives, scope and sequence.

Experientialists: Adhere to Dewey's pragmatic philosophy. Reform begins with the interests and concerns that emerge from learners' experiences. Teachers and learners together build projects to understand more deeply the problems. Curriculum reform is enhanced by grass roots participation of those who will be affected most directly by the reform; the community and the workplace.

Conciliators: An outgrowth of an attempt to find the middle ground among the three prevailing philosophies; intellectual, behaviorist, and experientialists. Successful examples of conciliator approaches include Sizer's (1984) Coalition of Essential Schools and Comer's (1980) Schools For Inner-City Populations. (Cited in Schubert, 1993, pp 81-85)

Each of these four orientations presents a value that people can bring to social studies reform. However, the vocal and sometimes bitter differences among the intellectualists, behaviorists, and experientialists when it comes to reform have given rise more recently to the influence of the conciliatory movement. The conciliatory approach is most likely the one used most often today in schools, both in theory and in operation (Schubert 1993, p. 86).

III. Processes of Curriculum Development at the National Level

A. Types of Standards

Smith, Fuhrman, and O'Day (1994) suggest the primary reason student achievement has remained rather flat over the past 20 years is the absence of high and challenging standards for the content of instruction, student performance, and school quality (p. 14) They advocate the setting of

challenging national standards for all students and the National Council on Educational Standards and Testing - NCEST (1992) certainly is a major force behind national standards. The NCEST suggests five levels of standards:

- **Overarching Statement:** A general vision of the nature of the standard for the content area. An example is the "Mathematical Power" statement in the California Mathematics Framework: Mathematical power, which involves the ability to discern mathematical relationships, reason logically, and use mathematical techniques effectively, must be the central concern of mathematics education and must be the context in which skills are developed" (California State Department of Education, 1995).
- **Content Standards:** Setting out the knowledge, skills, and other necessary understandings that schools should teach to ensure all U. S. students attain high levels of competency in subject matter in grades K-12. NCEST cites the standards established by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1989) as a primary example.
- **Student Performance Standards:** The degree or quality of performance in the subject matter. The advanced placement tests (AP) of the College Board of Advanced Placement is an example with a rating of from 1-5 on a test: 3= passing; 4 = B; and 5 means superior performance equating to an A.
- **School Delivery Standards**: These are considered "opportunity to learn" standards in which the state and/or local educators, policy makers and the public are able to assess the quality of the school's capacity in providing the challenging subject matter. This level of the standard matrix asks questions such as; (1) does the school have the appropriate materials, (2) are the teachers trained sufficiently to deliver the content, (3) does the curriculum reflect the content

standards such that students can master it to a high level of performance, and (4) does the performance of the students indicate the school is successfully providing all students the opportunity to learn?

- **System Delivery Standards:** standards that set out criteria for the quality of the school system's capacity and performance in educating all students in the subject matter. Goal 3 and 4 established by the National Education Goals Panel (1992) is an example of a system delivery standard:

  Goal 3: By the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter...

  Goal 4: By the year 2000, U. S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

B. 1994 National Standards in Social Studies

The latest revision of the suggested curriculum in social studies is exemplified by the Curriculum Standards For Social Studies (NCSS, 1994) developed by a task force commissioned by the National Council for the Social Studies. The task force consisted of 11 professional teachers from elementary, middle, and high schools; university and college teachers; and state and school district social studies supervisors. The task force was chaired by Donald Schneider, a university professor. The framework for the 1994 standards consists of ten curriculum standards, several performance standards for each curriculum standard, and examples of how teachers might provide instruction in a way that students can meet the performance standards. The 10 curriculum standards are themes incorporating fields of study that roughly correspond with one or more relevant disciplines. These themes (called curriculum standards) span the educational levels from early grades, to middle grades, to high school. The standards,

summarized below, are expressed in statements that begin with "Social studies programs should include experiences that provide for the study of ...:

1. ...culture and cultural diversity.
2. ...ways human beings view themselves in and over time.
3. ...people, places, and environments.
4. ...individual development and identity.
5. ...interactions among individuals, groups, and institutions.
6. ...how people create and change structures of power, authority, and governance.
7. ...how people organize for the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services.
8. ...relationships among science, technology, and society.
9. ...global connections and interdependence.
10. ideals, principles, and practices of citizenship in a democratic republic.

With each standard are provided performance expectations for each of three levels; early grades, middle grades, and high school. An example of a performance standard for the first curriculum standard on culture is: "explore and describe similarities and difference in the ways groups, societies, and cultures address similar human needs and concerns (NCSS, 1994, p. 33)." For each curriculum standard, five to eight performance standards are suggested. For each performance standard, several examples are provided to illustrate how that performance standard could be translated into classroom practices. These examples are typically short vignettes describing what a teacher did to help his/her students achieve the performance expectations.

IV. Processes of Curriculum Development at the State Level

Smith, Fuhrman, and O'Day (1994) suggest that the discussion of national standards always brings forward three major questions: (1) Will they have a positive influence on student achievement? (2) What is the potential effect on educational equity? and (3) are they even appropriate given the tradition of local control and the existing wide variation in state and local resources for education? The third question is more interesting to this discussion since persons with whom I spoke always mentioned the importance of local control. Opponents of national standards tend to believe such standards could be too centralizing and might constrain states, communities, and schools from responding effectively to their constituents. Also and from the experience and perspective of this author, national standards typically come from experts in the content areas and that suggests heavy intellectualist perceptive whereas, in the Vermont curriculum reform movement, a populists grass roots approach involving the town people, the overriding influence would appear to be more from an experientialists perspective.

The work of Richard Elmore and Susan Fuhrman (1994) is crucial to this topic. They have provided valuable insight into the governance of curriculum development at the national, state, and local level. Anyone involved in studying process is advised to obtain this monograph. More and more it would appear that the more aggressive ownership state legislative bodies are now assuming over the curricular and instructional direction of their states suggests that national standards no longer have the clout they once had. In fact, Massell (1994) says that standards, whether national or local, will likely be filtered through state and legislative policies (p. 84). It is also true that standards development tends to vary according to the approach an entity takes toward the following questions:

- Are the standards going to be more abstract or more detailed in nature?
- Are the standards based in a subject-matter perspective or in a skill-based perspective which is not linked to any one discipline?
- Is the focus on content, outcomes, performance standards, or teaching pedagogy? (Massell, 94, p. 87)

The process of developing standards appears to be terribly weighted by the approach that is used in selecting those who make the recommendations. Massell (1994) says there are basically two distinct approaches: the populist approach and the professional elite approach. The populist movement, analogous to the experientialist philosophy mentioned earlier (Schubert, 1993), maximizes representation of the lay public at all stages of development (identifying goals, drafting documents, and reviewing and revising documents). The professional elite approach, similar to the intellectualists philosophy mentioned earlier, places emphasis on the professionals and is more selective about who participates. Massell characterizes California as a prime example of the professional elite approach to curriculum development and Vermont as prime examples of the populist approach (Massell, 1994, pp. 88-89).

Assisted by the literature, coupled with phone conversations I have had with individuals at the local, state and national level, following are brief descriptions of the curriculum development efforts in four benchmark states; California Vermont, Kentucky, and South Carolina. They were selected because: (1) many consider the curriculum reform efforts in these states to be exemplars; (2) they illustrate two diametrically opposing philosophies toward curriculum development; and (3) materials and information were more readily available given the limited time provided for the project. Four topics are included with each state: the curriculum makers and underlying philosophy; the process of designing curriculum;

the curriculum framework document; and information about process evaluation when it is available. Although I had direct discussion with a key leader of the curriculum reform movement in Vermont, I had to rely on the literature for information in the other states. Key references for me include Elmore's and Fuhrman's (1994), The Governance of Curriculum, Diane Massell's (1994) "Achieving Consensus: Setting the Agenda for State Curriculum Reform," Schubert's (1993) "Curriculum Reform," and the 1994 Curriculum Standards For Social Studies. Without these contributions I would have needed dozens more hours on the phone.

California

Curriculum design in California can be characterized as subject-matter driven and written by professional experts with little substantial input from the public. The curriculum processes is discipline based with precise subject-matter standards (California Department of Education, 1990). Curriculum is the responsibility of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, an advisory board to the State Board of Education. Curriculum "Frameworks" are revised on eight year cycles. The Board of Education appoints a Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee to serve until the framework is completed. The document itself includes not only lists of knowledge categorized by subject matter, but pedagogy to be used. Following are some characteristics of the process of curriculum development in California:

1. The Curriculum Makers and Underlying Philosophy
    - Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bill Honig, was elected in 1982 on a platform that promised a more traditional academic education. He used curriculum frameworks as his centerpiece to leverage new standards.

- Governance over curriculum is in the hands of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission, an advisory body to the State Board of Education.
- State policy-makers wanted a curriculum that reflected cutting-edge positions within subject matters and to provide strong leadership to the field.
- When curriculum is up for review every eight years, the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission recommends and the State Board of Education appoints a Curriculum Framework and Criteria Committee to serve until the new document is completed.

2. The Process of Designing Curriculum

- Committee composition is weighted heavily with professionals within each subject matter; university faculty, teachers, other educators with strong expertise in subject matter.
- A representational matrix is also used to included representation from geographic areas, race, gender, ethnicity, established interest groups such as teacher unions, and special education lobbies. However, there is a deliberate attempt to give priority to the professional opinions and to eliminate at the writing stage those extremes of the political or pedagogical spectrum.
- Lay citizens do have limited access to standard setting, but the emphasis is on professional participation. Unlike many other states, California does not require early participation by the lay public or those outside of the writing team. However, public hearings are held prior to adoption.
- Once adopted, the state holds regional "awareness" conferences that lay public may attend. Again, most participates are professional educators.

3. The Curriculum Framework Document

- The product is a conceptual roadmap that highlights "big ideas" written in a literary narrative style to convey the information in a compelling and understandable way.
- It is not a detailed document teachers can use directly in the classroom; but it does offer general pedagogical advise.
- The more recent revision of standards take a more decisive stance than previous frameworks on professional or public controversies in particular fields; e.g., the teaching of religion.
- While previous frameworks focused heavily on guidelines for selecting textbooks, the new frameworks provide a foundations for staff development, teacher certification, student assessment, and accountability.
- Since California is a textbook adoption state, textbooks tend to be selected to match the curriculum framework. Because curriculum is considered controversial due to its inclusion of religion and other issues, publishers are more reluctant to produce materials based solely on California's standards.

4. Evaluation of the Process/Product

- There was no information available on evaluation of the process of curriculum design.
- Curriculum in each subject area is reviewed every eight years or so. When this occurs, curriculum committees comprised of expert professionals in the subject area are appointed to review the curriculum and recommend changes.
- According to Massell (1994, p. 101), no formal surveys have been done to review consensus or awareness of California's frameworks.

Vermont

The curriculum process in Vermont can be characterized as skill-based, outcome oriented, and designed and maintained by substantial and continuous input from the general public. The Vermont Department of Education (VDE) is responsible for designing and revising curriculum. However, the VDE often views itself as the coordinator and facilitator of a populist approach that engages as many citizens in the process as possible. Unlike California, there is strong sentiment in Vermont to avoid curriculum that is designed around subject matter. Rather, the public has asked for a curriculum that is based on skills students need to possess in order to be successful in work and in places outside of the school setting. Involvement of expert professionals in the design of curriculum is not of paramount importance nor are the standards provided by the National Council for the Social Studies. Input from all the citizens of Vermont is what is valued the most.

1. The Curriculum Makers and Underlying Philosophy

    - The Vermont Department of Education (VDE) is the agency responsible for curriculum development.
    - The state wanted to provide common outcomes without describing discipline-based content. Discipline-based content was too prescriptive and would lock in traditional knowledge and possibly exclude more integrated approaches.
    - The centerpiece of the Vermont curriculum is its Common Core of Learning (CCL) which was initiated by the VDE. The CCL is a series of five (now six) reports centered around what students should know and be able to do.

- The VDE views itself more as the coordinating center because curriculum development draws strongly from outside groups with no special attention given at all to the professionally elite, i.e., subject matter specialists, professors, teachers, and professional organizations, etc.
- Curriculum was developed through a series of town meetings, called Focus Forums, involving as many communities as wanted to participate. Community members were contacted through a random selection of registered voters.

2. The Process of Designing Curriculum

- Vermont's agenda-setting approach is distinct for including a broad cross section of lay citizens and professional educators.
- The VDE sponsored town meetings in any community that requested one. These meetings were known as Focus Forums.
- Membership was open, but registered voters within a community were randomly selected to receive an invitation to the focus forum. Forums reached beyond teachers and business leaders to a broad scope of lay citizens. One goal of the forums was to engage people not usually involved in school affairs.
- Forum facilitators divided participants into small groups for discussion purposes, but group membership was purposefully not arranged along discipline or subject matter lines.
- In order to help structure feedback along skill-based outcomes rather than subject area outcomes, facilitators asked participates to think about three questions:

    1. What skills, knowledge and attitudes will learners need to be successful in the 21st century?
    2. What programs exist now that are in harmony with your vision?

3. What can schools, communities, and businesses together do today that would make a difference (VDE, 1991, p. 18).

- By 1992 more than 40 forums were held involving 2,000 people. The information and recommendations that came through these forums were referred to as "core curriculum" and were forwarded to the VDE.
- Forty-member commissions were established for each of three academic areas: history and social science; art and literature; and science, mathematics, and technology. Members included parents, students, business leaders, and school professionals. The Commission took the "core curriculum" from the focus forums and arranged them into broad categories. For each broad category, general statements or "standards" were generated, e.g., "by the time students graduate from school they will ..." Some standards were content knowledge based and others were performance based.
- Drafts of the standards were circulated back to those participants in the focus forums and also every teacher in the state. A revision of the standards was then prepared for submission to the VDE for consideration and action.
- In 1994-95 the standards were adopted by the VDE and circulated throughout the state. Standards are only suggestions as are the suggestions for reaching standards. Vermont is not a textbook adoption state; therefore, textbooks are not required.
- In 1995-96 the Social Science Commission will write curriculum guides which, in this case, present very general ideas about how teachers might help students meet those standards. The guides offer suggestions for what materials and activities could be used and provide examples of model instructional programs and environments throughout the state.

- 1996-97 - Piloting the Curriculum. While the curriculum guides are in process of development and revision, schools are being solicited to pilot test the curriculum. The plan is for volunteer schools to test the standards, the curriculum guides, and to refine the process.
- 1997 and Thereafter - Reports of successful programs based on the new standards will be provided to all educators throughout Vermont.
- There is no plan for a state-wide adoption nor will the Department of Education or the legislature require that schools use the developed curriculum.

3. The Product

- The product is a document called Common Core of Learning (CCL) which is a series of five (now six) reports that are now in the process of development.
    a. Standards for what students should know and be able to do.
    b. Examples of successful learning environments.
    c. Model instructional programs.
    d. Examples of effective local action.
    e. Successful ways to organize education to reach those core student outcomes.
    f. Curriculum Frameworks (added later).
- All curriculum was clustered into three broad academic clusters: History and Social Sciences; Art and Literature; and Science, Mathematics and Technology.
- The thousands of core curriculum recommendations from the focus forums are reclassified into broad skill areas for which standards are generated. Standards are recommended, not mandated or required.

- With portfolio assessment now required in Vermont, there is an effort to align the portfolio assessment with the curriculum standards.

4. Evaluation of the Process/Product

- The only reported evaluation of this process was in 1994-95 when the standards, written by the 40 member writing teams in each of the three academic areas, were circulated back to the original participants in the focus forums (and all teachers in Vermont) for review and suggestions.
- In my conversation with Elise Guyette, one of the leading consultants in the curriculum reform movement in Vermont, she had no knowledge of any formal process evaluation; only product evaluation.

Kentucky

The curriculum process in Kentucky is characterized as a modification of the strict populist process design used in Vermont; that is, while the public is involved in generating broad goals, the outcomes and standards are typically left to professional educators. Standard-setting became new to Kentucky when the governor established a temporary Council on School Performance Standards (1991). Its job was to identify what students should know and be able to do. The primary influence on curriculum reform, however, was the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 - KERA. Among its major goals included revised curriculum, reformed governance, and a redesigned decision-making process so it occurs at the local level. An important additional goal of the KERA was to rid the education system of continual problems with political manipulation, nepotism, and cronyism (Dove, 1991). Although historically Kentucky had a professional elitism approach to curriculum, the KERA clearly changed that in order to guarantee the involvement of the general public in such decisions. Whereas

Vermont leaves little room for strong influence from the professional elite, the Kentucky plan leaves plenty of room for both public opinion from the general populous and profession input from content area experts.

1. The Curriculum Makers and Underlying Philosophy

- The General Assembly of Kentucky is the legislative body governing the state and it is responsible for oversight of the state's educational system.
- Pressured from the general public for more input and better alignment between what students do in school and at work, the governor appointed a temporary Council on School Performance Standards in 1989 to set direction on what students should know and be able to do. The Council produced a set of six learning goals that were largely skill-based rather than subject-matter based. This change was the result of strong influence from the general public.
- One year later, in 1990, the General Assembly passed the Kentucky Education Reform Act which established new directions for education reform. Its goals included reforming curriculum, restructuring educational governance, redirect decision-making to the local level, and excise the educational system of political manipulation, nepotism, and cronyism.
- As a result of the KERA of 1990, the Council on School Performance Standards was charged with: (a) elaborating on the six learning goals identified earlier in ways that could be assessed; (b) provide outcomes for each of the six goals, called "value outcomes," that could be vocationally oriented; and (c) draft a curriculum framework to provide examples of what students should know arranged by educational level, i.e., elementary, middle, and secondary.

2. The Process of Designing Curriculum

- Unlike Vermont, Kentucky relies primarily on education professionals throughout each step in standards setting.
- Early in the process, however, the public help to shape the six original learning goals through a series of focus group interviews conducted by members of the Council. Members in the discussion groups included business leaders, employers, parents, and educators from around the state.
- Based on the response of the focus groups, a telephone survey was designed and 830 additional citizens were phoned at random. The public voiced a strong mandate to make the schools more relevant to the workplace and to other after-school experiences.
- Based on the feedback from the focus groups and the telephone interviews, the learning goals were drafted, not by the lay public, but by committees of professionals appointed by the Council. Once completed, the focus groups were reconvened where the drafts were reviewed.
- Following agreement on the six goals, the Kentucky Department of Education was responsible for developing outcomes. In this case, committees of educators and school administrators were chosen from throughout the state. It was important that the most competent professionals participate at this level of design. Because of the state's reputation for nepotism and cronyism, the Department developed a double blind procedure to selecting committee membership whereby the 450 applicants were reviewed without regard to their names. Persons were selected based on their educational philosophy and then sorted to make sure that geographically and other diversity issues were accommodated.

- These committees developed 75 "value" outcomes, later referred to as "learning" outcomes due to criticism from the religious right (Thomas, 1993). The general public was not involved in this process and pedagogy was not specified.
- From the six goals and 75 value outcomes, a curriculum framework was designed which further elaborated on the 75 outcomes by providing examples of what students should be able to do, listed by level; elementary, middle, and secondary. It also included instructional and assessment strategies, activities across the curriculum, and ideas for incorporating community resources.

3. The Product

- The curriculum document does not identify separate frameworks for each disciplines as is the case in California and South Carolina. It is a single 500 page document that contextualizes its six learning goals and value outcomes within the different subject areas.
- The curriculum is also not a narrative like California and South Carolina. Under each of the six goals are lists of value outcomes; under value outcomes are lists of examples of skills students should be able to perform at different levels of education.
- The document includes:

    1. Six board learning goals.

    2. Value outcomes for each goal are listed in table format in which the BIG ideas of what students should know. In all, 75 value outcomes were identified.

    3. A curriculum framework is the third component to the document. This framework elaborates on each of the 75 outcomes by providing examples of what students should be able to do (listed by level; elementary, middle, and secondary), instructional and

assessment strategies, activities across the curriculum, and ideas for incorporating community resources.

4. Evaluation of the Process/Product

- There were no data available on whether the process used to design curriculum reform was evaluated. It is known that the general public participated in the original mandate that the curriculum be aligned to work and experiences outside of school. It is known that professional educators were primarily involved thereafter.
- Systematic review of the curriculum or of the process has been seriously curtailed due to financial hardship. In fact, only 300 copies of the curriculum were ultimately distributed by the Kentucky Department of Education. These copies went to curriculum personnel in regional meetings. Lack of funds has limited the distribution of the final document to one copy per school district.

South Carolina

Curriculum efforts in South Carolina are similar to those in California except they have been modified more recently to include more public opinion and feedback once the experts have essentially drafted the curriculum. It is based on subject matter disciplines and the document is written in narrative form like California.

1. The Curriculum Makers and Underlying Philosophy

- The South Carolina Department of Education has direct control over appointments to the curriculum writing committees and the Curriculum Review Panel which functions like California's Curriculum Commission.

- Barbara Nielson, superintendent of Education, believes that curriculum frameworks should be the fulcrum of the state's reform efforts, i.e., that curriculum should shift away from a basic skills approach toward a more demanding higher order curriculum.
- Drafting of curriculum documents, like California, is done by writing teams consisting of professional experts "who are one or two standard deviations ahead of others in their field." Professionals have strong control over the first draft of curriculum documents.
- To involve the lay public once curriculum is drafted, there is a Curriculum Congress which is an advisory board set up by the Department of Education to ensure involvement of the lay public and grassroots of school professionals. Membership is open to all interested parties.
- Members of the Curriculum Congress join (a) a discipline-based subgroup, (b) a work area group to develop curriculum, instruction, assessment, materials, or (c) a bridge group that tries to align the first two groups. Members of the Curriculum Congress interact with and advise the curriculum framework writing teams on a regular basis.
- Drafted curriculum frameworks are disseminated widely in the state for review and feedback. Initial distribution was about 4,500 copies, but now numbers 40,000 or more and is distributed to beauty salons, barber shops, libraries, and radio and TV media. This is a major diversion from the California and Kentucky models.

2. The Process of Designing Curriculum

- Curriculum frameworks are designed by writing teams composed of the most professionally elite experts in the various subject matter disciples.

- Simultaneous to the writing process, the Curriculum Congress, comprised of both lay public and professional educators, interact with and respond to members of the writing team while the documents are in progress.
- Once documents are drafted, they are printed and distributed widely by the South Carolina Department of Education to private and public businesses throughout the state. The attempt is to receive feedback from textbook publishers, educators at all levels (curriculum supervisors, administrators, teachers, and higher education faculty), the Curriculum Congress itself, the business community, and school improvement committees.

3. The Product
   - The curriculum is designed around subject-matter frameworks like the California model.
   - Frameworks embody content standards that form the basis for local policy instruments, staff development, instructional materials, student assessment, and teacher preservice and inservice.
   - In 1992 the Department published its first drafts of frameworks in mathematics, foreign languages, and fine arts.
   - Frameworks are written in narrative literary style, like California, and discuss the "big ideas" in each of the discipline areas. Frameworks include student performance standards, examples of different instructional strategies, and criteria for instructional materials selection.
4. Evaluation of the Process/Product
   - No information on process evaluation is available at this time.

IV. Conclusions

Curriculum redesign for the 21st century presents challenges at the state level that were not present in earlier years. In the 1980s, for example, state departments of education operated on three assumptions:

1. They knew what the problems were.
2. They knew how to solve the problems by mandating academic improvement.
3. They felt they had the ability to implement solutions. (Lusi, 1994, p. 116).

Although all reform has had at its base the desire to improve student learning, teaching more academic courses, hiring more competent teachers, and increasing graduation requirements, results of testing indicate these reforms have not achieved these desired outcome. In reality, states cannot identify what schools need to be doing nor do they have the capacity to ensure that schools do what they should do. Lusi (1994), however, proposes five mechanisms that state level governing bodies could use to promote and support what schools do to improve academic learning:

1. Provide incentives to encourage the planning and implementation of reform.
2. Contribute knowledge to the school reform process in the form of curriculum frameworks, synthesis of current research, and relevant publications.
3. Help focus schools' attention on desired learning outcomes and provide feedback on how they are achieving outcomes through meaningful state assessment.
4. Provide assistance to schools wanting to redesign programs to improve student learning.
5. Traditional regulations imposed at the state level could be replaced by assessment systems that hold schools accountable for student achievement (Lusi, 1994, pp. 117-120).

All states want to design cutting-edge standards that promote change and improve students achievement. Determining who participates in the process and at what point they participate appears critical. The populist approach often produces broad public and professional approval, but takes the risk of being criticized by professional educators for not being cutting edge. The professional elite models may produce cutting-edge standards that move public education but may not have the buy-in and support of the lay public. Although most states include the lay public at some point, at what point in that process can strongly control their ultimate influence on standards. In California and South Carolina the public is involved after the professional educators have drafted the document. There is some question about whether opinions after the draft level has much influence on change. When the public is involved at the beginning, as in Kentucky and Vermont, or throughout the entire process, as in Vermont, there may a stronger argument for the value given to the public for its opinions.

Whether curriculum standards are created with a subject-matter orientation or according to skills that students should know or be able to do is a critical decision for states to consider. A subject-matter orientation, as discipline-based professionals would say, is a needed foundation for ultimately branching out to other fields such as interdisciplinary studies. Skills-oriented professionals, however, would argue that skills-based standards will provide better ways for organizing knowledge and problem solving through interdisciplinary thinking. When professional educators are the major influence on curriculum design, they are likely to think along line of disciplines because their own orientation and expertise has been developed largely along strict subject matter lines. Most professionals are experts in history, geography, civics or economic, but rarely a generalist in the more broadly based social studies. When the public is involved at the beginning of curriculum design, they tend to be preoccupied with skills they

believe students should know or be able to do that will make them more successful or productive in the work and home place. Industry would consider this approach as taking care of customer careabouts.

Massell (1994) stated that "as states chart new curriculum reform, they will confront the ever present challenges of building consensus for change and constructing meaningful standards" (p. 105). Whichever the approach, however, the importance of consensus building will now require a greater amount of time in order to involve all customers in the process. As someone said recently, pleasing everyone takes more time.

Bibliography

California Department of Education (1990). Science Framework. Sacramento, Ca.: California Department of Education

California State Department of Education (1985). Mathematics Curriculum Framework For California Public Schools. Sacramento, California: California State Dept. of Education.

Comer, J. P. (1980). "Schools For Inner City Populations." In School Power. New York: Free Press of Macmillan.

Council on School Performance Standards (December, 1991). Kentucky's Learning Goals and Valued Outcomes. Louisville, Ky: Council on School Performance Standards.

Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools (1989; 1994). Charting a Course: Social Studies For the 21st Century. Washington, D. C.; National Commission For the Social Studies in the Schools. .

Dove, R. G., Jr. (1991). "Acorns in a Mountain Pool: The Role of Litigation, law, and Lawyers in Kentucky Education Reform." Lexington, Kentucky: The Prichard Committee.

Lusi, Susan F. (1994). "Systemic School Reform: The Challenges Faced By State Departments of Education." Chapter 7 in The Governance of Curriculum: 1994 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Richard Elmore and Susan Fuhrman, eds.). Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Massell, Diane (1994). Achieving Consensus: Setting the Agenda for State Curriculum Reform. Chapter 6 in Elmore, Richard F. and Fuhrman, Susan H. (eds.) The Governance of Curriculum, 1994 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

National Association for Core Curriculum, Inc. Dr. Gordon F. Vars, Executive Secretary and Treasurer, 1100 East Summit Street, Suite 5, Kent, Ohio 44240 (Phone: 216-678-0006).

National Council For the Social Studies. 3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20016 (Phone: 800-296-7840).

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1989). Curriculum and Evaluation Standards For School Mathematics. Reston, Virginia: NCTM.

National Council on Educational Standards and Testing (January 24, 1992). Raising Standards For American Education. Washington, D. C.: NCEST.

National Education Goal Panel (1992). Building a Nation of Learners. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Parkway Public Schools (1995). Mary McFarland, Director of Social Studies K-12, Instructional Services Center, Parkway School District, St. Louis, Mo (Phone: 314-469-8525).

Schubert, William H. (1986). Curriculum: Perspectives, Paradigms, and Possibility. New York: Macmillan.

Schubert, William H. (1993). "Curriculum Reform." Chapter 4 in Cawelti, Gordon (ed.), Challenges and Achievement of American Education, The 1993 ASCD Yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sizer, Ted (1984). " Coalition of Essential Schools." In Horace's Compromise. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, Marshall S., Fuhrman, Susan H., and O'Day, Jennifer (1994). "National Curriculum Standards: Are They Desirable and Feasible?" Chapter 2 in Elmore, Richard F. and Fuhrman, Susan H. (eds.) The Governance of Curriculum, 1994 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and

Curriculum Development. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Thomas, J. A. (May 21, 1993). "Eagle Forum Opening Fire Against KERA." The Mayfield Messenger, P. 1.

Vermont Commission on Social Science (1995). Elise Guyette, Consultant and Chair of the Social Science Curriculum Commission (Phone: 802-658-1209).

Additional References Related to Curriculum Development

Boschee, Floyd., and Baron, Mark A. (1993). Outcome-Based Education: Developing Programs Through Strategic Planning. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [Plans for developing vision, learner outcomes, program philosophy, program goals, score and sequence, learner outcomes; delivering outcomes-based education; assessing outcomes-based education.]

Chalker, Donald M., and Haynes, Richard M. (1994). World Class Schools: New Standards For Education. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [A guide to world class educational standards; a set of uniform standards and comparison to standards in the U.S. education system, and to standards in 10 other countries including Britain, Canada, France, China, New Zealand, Germany, Israel, Korea, and Japan.]

Frase, Larry E., English, Fenwick E., Poston, Williams K. (eds) (1995). The Curriculum Management Audit: Improving School Quality. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [proposal for a tool to help determine the adequacy of the curriculum, with emphasis on documents, management, and delivery]

Gehrke, N. J., Knapp, M. S., and Sirotnik, K. A. (1992). "In Search of the School Curriculum." In Review of Research in Education, edited by G. Grant. Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association.

Kaufman, Roger, and Herman, Jerry (1994). Strategic Planning in Education: Rethinking, Restructuring, Revitalizing. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [Handbook on implementing strategies planning; step-by-step strategical, tactical, and technical suggestions.]

National Association For Core Curriculum. Dr. Gordon Vars, Executive Secretary. 1100 East Summit Street, Suite 5, Kent, OH 44240. Phone: 216-678-0006.

National Council For the Social Studies. Martharose Laffey, Executive Director. 3501 Newark Street, NW, Washington, DC 20016. Phone 1-800-296-7840.

Ogden, Evelyn H., and Germinario, Vito (1995). The Nation's Best Schools: Blueprints for Excellence. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [Descriptions of the top 2% of schools in the country; their standards, curriculum, staff development, and more.]

Risingerm C. Frederick (1992). Trenes in K-12 Social Studies. EDO-SO-92-8, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. Bloomington, IN

Steffy, Betty E. (1993). The Kentucky Education Reform: Lessons For America. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co. [The legislation, what students will know and be able to do, the new curriculum, professional development, and more.]

Thomson, Scott D. (ed.). (1993). Principals for Our Changing Schools. Lancaster, Penn.: Technomic Publishing Co.

Weiss, I. (1992). "The Road to Reform in Mathematics Education: How Far Have We Traveled?" Arlington, Virginia: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Zollman, A., and Mason, E. (November, 1992). "The Standards Beliefs Instrument (SBI): Teachers' Beliefs about the NCTM Standards." School Science and Mathematics 92, 7: 359-363.